

long axis almost horizontal, I found the eggs reposing in perfect safety. The upward trend of the entrance, forming the "pent-house" of Wilson, naturally decreases the liability of the eggs to fall out, even if the wind should force the side of entrance toward the earth. It therefore appears to me at least probable that the main object of this Wren in constructing its elaborate dwelling is protection from the wind rather than the rain.

It has also been my experience that the top of the nest is generally more firmly fastened to the reeds than the bottom, and in two instances I noticed among the partially leveled reeds nests whose bases swung free of all support, thus retaining their original perpendicular position. However, this may have been the result of accident rather than design.

The taking of three sets of white eggs, presumably of this species, may be of interest. They consist of four, five, and four eggs, and were taken on June 24, July 11, and July 28, 1893, near the edge of a small salt-water ditch in the Quinnipiack Marshes, Hamden, Conn. The nests, which are fairly typical of *C. palustris*, were not more than eight yards apart, and probably belonged to the same bird. The eggs are white, translucent when taken, irregular in shape, and several have small, roughened projections on the shell. One from the set of five has a few dark spots half concealed beneath the surface of the shell and most perceptible in holding the egg to the light.

C. palustris is the only Wren known to inhabit this marsh, and a male, which I believed to be the owner of the first set, together with a Wren which settled for an instant at the entrance of the third nest, were of this species. The character of the locality, and the large numbers of the Long-billed Marsh Wrens everywhere around, made more certain identification impossible.

The white eggs of this species which have been recorded, taken in connection with the normally white eggs of its near ally, *C. stellaris*, and the frequently white eggs of the Bluebird (*Sialia sialis*) have to my mind a peculiar importance as an additional argument for the truth of the theory of protective coloration, the covering of the nest rendering the usual dark pigment unnecessary.—LOUIS B. BISHOP, M. D., *New Haven, Conn.*

[Albinistic eggs are well-known to occur more or less frequently in birds that normally lay colored or spotted eggs, and which do not breed in holes or in covered nests; just as albinism may occur in the bird itself in any species. Why, then, should abnormally pale eggs be considered as having any special significance in the two species above cited?—J. A. A.]

Distribution of the Hudsonian Chickadee.—In his paper on 'The Hudsonian Chickadee and its Allies,' published in 'The Auk' of Oct. 1893, Mr. Rhoads makes the statement (p. 322) that "this Chickadee is a rare visitor in Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, and for that matter, in any non-mountainous locality south of Hudson's Bay." This is entirely con-

trary to my experience. In that part of Nova Scotia that I am particularly familiar with, Annapolis, Yarmouth and Digby Counties, this bird is extremely abundant. Every autumn for the past eight years I have spent a month or more with Digby as my headquarters.

Here the Hudsonian Chickadee is rather hard to shoot owing to the nature of the country it inhabits, keeping almost exclusively in the thick second growth spruce and fir woods, but in a day's walk through their favorite haunts I never fail to see less than twenty-five or fifty and often many times that number. In October and November they are in large loose flocks in company with the Common Chickadee and the Golden-crowned Kinglet, and often the spruce woods seem fairly alive with these birds, always in motion, always passing on and on through the spruces, so fast that it is impossible to keep up to them. Often while walking through these dense forests of evergreens, suddenly as if by magic, the trees about one will become alive with these three species, their cheerful notes sounding from every branch and the next moment, as suddenly as they came, they will disappear again and leave the forest still and gloomy as before.

The country about Digby is strictly non-mountainous, and what hills there are, as the North Mountain back of the town of Digby, and the hills back of Granville on the opposite side of the Annapolis Basin, are covered with a hard wood growth, for the most part, principally beach. I never found the Hudsonian Chickadee in these woods. In fact I have never seen them except very occasionally anywhere but in the thick spruces and firs.

My own experience is, as I have stated above, confined to the autumn months, but my friend, Mr. H. A. P. Smith of Digby, N. S., who is a careful observer, tells me the bird is strictly resident and breeds abundantly.

In August and September, 1880, my brother, E. A. Bangs, was camped on the Restigouche River, N. B., and found the Hudsonian Chickadee very abundant all along the river. He got a good series of them without any difficulty.

So far from its being a rare visitor in any non-mountainous locality south of Hudson's Bay, I should be much surprised not to find the Hudsonian Chickadee abundant in any part of Canada, New Brunswick or Northern Maine, where the country was suitable to its mode of life.—
OUTRAM BANGS, *Boston, Mass.*

Notes on Some Long Island Birds.—*Empidonax flaviventris.*—Mr. E. F. Carson, of Brooklyn, has kindly permitted me to record two specimens of this Flycatcher, which he has secured in the vicinity of Brooklyn, N. Y. The first one was killed in a tree on Madison Street, in the heart of the city, on June 10, 1893; the second was shot in the woods at Parkville, Kings County, on August 19, 1893. They were both males, and the only ones we have met with on Long Island.

Empidonax acadicus.—On June 10, 1893, I shot a male of this species in tall woods covering a hillside in Woodhaven, Queens County. The bird